

A MODEL OF NON-LOCAL QUANTUM ELECTRODYNAMICS : TIME'S ARROW AND EPR-LIKE QUANTUM CORRELATION

T K Rai Dastidar* and Krishna Rai Dastidar**

Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science, Calcutta 700032, India

ABSTRACT

A recent experiment with squeezed light has shown that two-photon absorption by an atom can occur with a *linear intensity dependence*. We point out that this result verifies a prediction made by us a decade back from an analysis of a non-local model of Quantum Electrodynamics. This model had earlier been proposed by us in an *ad hoc* manner to interpret certain features of multiphoton double ionisation and above-threshold ionisation in an atom placed in a strong laser field ; in this paper we show that the model can be obtained field-theoretically by demanding covariance of the field Lagrangian under a non-local U(1) gauge transformation. We also show that the model makes direct contact with squeezed light, and thus allows us to describe these two completely different scenarios from a unified point of view. We obtain a fundamentally new result from our non-local model of QED, namely that *only the past, but not the future, can influence the present* — thus establishing a non-thermodynamic arrow of time. We also show that correlations within a quantum system *should necessarily be of the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR)-type*, a result that agrees with Bell's theorem. These results follow from the simple requirement of energy conservation in matter-radiation interaction. Furthermore, we also predict new and experimentally verifiable results on the basis of our model QED.

* Department of Materials Science. E-mail : mstkrd@mahendra.iacs.res.in

** Department of Spectroscopy. E-mail : spkrd@mahendra.iacs.res.in

1. INTRODUCTION

In a beautiful experiment, Georgiades et al [1] generated a squeezed vacuum field by an optical parametric amplifier and focussed it onto a cloud of cesium atoms in a magneto-optic trap. They found that the rate of the two-photon transition $6S_{1/2} \rightarrow 6D_{5/2}$ deviated from the expected quadratic intensity dependence to a form $R = \alpha I + \beta I^2$, where I was the squeezed vacuum intensity ; the linear term dominated at low intensities, and the quadratic term at higher intensities. Our conventional wisdom tells us that this feature of linear intensity dependence of two-photon transitions is shared neither by thermal light nor by coherent light.

In this paper we draw the reader's attention to a non-local model of Quantum Electrodynamics (QED), suggested quite a few years ago by us [2] in which a possibility of this linear intensity dependence of two-photon transitions was pointed out for the first time, albeit in a different context of multiphoton transitions and above-threshold ionisations in an atom placed in a laser field. We were led to this model of non-local QED through an analysis of the behaviour of an atom placed in an intense laser field under certain specified conditions — namely, that two distinct photon absorption events by the atomic electron/s be *correlated in phase* — and we obtained this two-photon transition with a linear intensity dependence as the central result of the paper. In [2], however, the non-local potential was introduced in an *ad hoc* manner ; in the present paper we provide a field-theoretical basis for the same and briefly repeat the analysis made in [2]. We bring out certain parallelisms between the two contexts (intense laser field and squeezed vacuum field) and show that the aforesaid model of non-local QED can be applied to both. As a particular result of this application, we find that the time evolution of an (atom + field) system under the said conditions shows a remarkable resemblance to a *squeezed vacuum*. (As we shall show, apart from pre-multiplying factors, they turn out to be *identical*). We further show that a specific result for a single-electron atom placed in a non-local electromagnetic field exactly matches the abovementioned experimental result of two-photon transition in Cesium placed in a squeezed vacuum.

Subsequent to our work [2], a few studies on squeezed light (e.g. Gea-Banacloche [3], Javanainen and Gould [4]) predicted this linear intensity dependence from certain special models of the four-field correlation function in squeezed light fields. Our approach needs no such squeezed-field-specific modelling, but is valid for all (classical as well as non-classical) radiation fields where phase-correlated photon absorption/emission can take place in interaction with matter, as we shall show below.

Consider an intense classical (thermal or laser) light incident on an atom, and let a pair of photon absorption events occur at two different space-time points $(\mathbf{r}, t)$ and $(\mathbf{r}', t')$, the interval between which is very close to zero, i.e. $|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'| \sim c|t - t'|$. This situation can arise when, say, the outer electrons of a Rydberg atom absorb a pair of photons within a time $\delta t \ll \frac{1}{\omega}$. For laser intensities of order 10^{10} W/cm² or higher, this is commonplace, if we remember that in the visible range, a flux of one photon $a_0^{-2}t_0^{-1}$ corresponds to $\sim 5 \times 10^{14}$ W/cm² of intensity (a_0 and t_0 being the atomic units of length and of time respectively). We have here a situation where two events, which may have occurred far apart in space, are correlated in phase ; indeed, if the events are spatially separated, the

correlation assumes the character of an EPR-like “quantum entanglement”.

Consider now a different scenario : radiation from an optical parametric oscillator generating a phase-squeezed vacuum field is absorbed by a three-level atom having a principal quantum number ≥ 5 . If the squeezed vacuum is produced by parametric frequency down-conversion, where an incident pump photon has split up into two lower-frequency photons (signal and idler) which constitute a highly correlated photon pair, a two-photon absorption similar as observed in [1] occurs ; i.e. two photons in exact (or nearly exact) phase correlation can be absorbed in two events widely separated in space even at low intensities.

The feature common to these two entirely different scenarios is evident. The latter scenario is directly linked to the abovementioned experimental finding in [1], while the former is linked to phase-correlated multiphoton excitation/ionization *in a regime where, however, perturbation theory holds*. In this paper we show that our model in [2] can be used, by exploiting this common feature of correlated atomic response to radiation at two points far apart in space, to give a theoretical description of these two different scenarios from a unified viewpoint. As already mentioned, the linear intensity dependence of two-photon processes comes about as a natural result of this model, and we shall show how this linear intensity dependence serves to explain several features long known in multiphoton double ionisation as well as in above-threshold ionisation, and also serves to predict some new results.

2. THEORY

In the usual simple harmonic oscillator mode expansion of the electromagnetic field potential $\mathbf{A}$, an integral number of photons (0,1,2,...) is associated with each mode. All these modes are orthogonal and independent of each other, and since photons obey the Bose statistics, each mode can be occupied by any arbitrary number of photons. However, in situations such as described above where a *phase-correlated behaviour* of photons becomes manifest, one might think whether a different, *correlated* type of mode expansion could better describe the situation, much as a correlated wave-function gives a better representation of, say, the Helium atom than the orbital product wavefunction does. Since there is no force acting between photons, the observed “correlation” between them is not due to any “configuration interaction” as in the case of a multi-electron system, but due either to the presence of certain non-classical features in the radiation field introduced by a non-linear medium (e.g. squeezing), or to correlated interaction of the radiation field with the atomic electrons, or both.

We start from the basic fact that in both these scenarios the radiation field (either as generated, or as detected by the atomic electrons) enjoys a large second-order coherence, i.e. two photons are *coherently* absorbed by the atomic electrons within a vanishingly small phase difference $\Delta\phi = \omega\delta t$. In a study of two-photon transition using a phase-squeezed light within the framework of the usual QED, Javanainen and Gould [4] observed that the “four-field correlation function $G^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, t; \mathbf{r}', t') = \langle E^-(\mathbf{r}, t)E^-(\mathbf{r}', t')E^+(\mathbf{r}', t')E^+(\mathbf{r}, t) \rangle$ ”, essentially the joint probability that two detectors placed at $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{r}'$ will record photon counts at times t and t' , does not always suffice to predict the two-photon transition rate.

In fact, we need a more general correlation function. . . We resort to heuristic modelling of the field correlations”.

In both [3] and [4] the authors gave new four-field correlation functions derived from specific properties of squeezed light. In the present paper we show that neither the use of such specific properties nor any heuristic modelling is necessary, if we adopt the earlier proposal of attempting a correlated description of the electromagnetic field.

We show below that the non-local model of QED as expounded in [2] serves to bring out the feature of (phase) correlation between two (or more) photon modes. Consider two zero-order dressed states $|\Psi_f\rangle = |\psi_f\rangle|n_f\rangle$ and $|\Psi_i\rangle = |\psi_i\rangle|n_i\rangle$. In the Coulomb gauge the radiation interaction matrix element coupling these two states is $M_{fi}(t) = -\frac{e}{mc}\langle\psi_f(\mathbf{r}), n_f|\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}, t)|\psi_i(\mathbf{r}), n_i\rangle$. As in our earlier work [2], we introduce a non-local potential $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{r}, t, \mathbf{r}', t')$ such that the above matrix element becomes

$$M_{fi}(t) = -\frac{e}{mc}\langle\psi_f(x), n_f|\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathcal{A}(x, x')|\psi_i(x'), n_i\rangle \quad \text{where } x \equiv (\mathbf{r}, t), \quad x' \equiv (\mathbf{r}', t'), \quad (1)$$

i.e. the interaction at the point x is correlated with the interactions at all other points x' . This non-local interaction had been defined in [2] in an *ad hoc* manner ; in this paper we show (see Appendix A) how such a potential can be introduced field-theoretically by demanding covariance under a non-local U(1) gauge transformation.

The integration in (1) runs over $d\mathbf{r}$ and dx' , and in this paper we set the limits of the time integral dt' either (i) from $-\infty$ to $t - \frac{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}{c}$ (giving the retarded interaction), or (ii) from $t + \frac{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}{c}$ to ∞ (which gives the advanced interaction), leaving out EPR “quantum entanglement”-like correlations for the present. We shall discuss the question of causality later and shall find that this restriction turns out to be unnecessary.

We can equivalently use a similar non-local form of the multipolar interaction at the space-time point x :

$$-e \int \mathbf{r}\cdot\mathcal{E}(x, x') dx' \quad (1')$$

Although nothing can be said about the specific mathematical forms of these non-local potentials/field strengths, we will find that we can go a long way to predict specific consequences of this general non-local field. In order to quantise this non-local field, we proceed by carrying out a Fourier expansion [5] of this non-local potential over the usual photon modes :

$$\mathcal{A}(x, x') = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1 \lambda_1} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_2 \lambda_2} [C_{12}\hat{\epsilon}_{12}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}') \exp(i\mathbf{k}_1\cdot\mathbf{r} + i\mathbf{k}_2\cdot\mathbf{r}' - i\omega_{\mathbf{k}_1}t - i\omega_{\mathbf{k}_2}t') + \text{c.c.}] \quad (2)$$

where we have written $C_{12} \equiv C_{\mathbf{k}_1 \lambda_1 \mathbf{k}_2 \lambda_2}$, and $\hat{\epsilon}_{12} \equiv \hat{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{k}_1 \lambda_1 \mathbf{k}_2 \lambda_2}$. In view of (1), we cannot fix the direction of the polarisation vector $\hat{\epsilon}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}')$ “by hand” (as in standard QED) without loss of generality ; this is at once obvious if we make the dipole approximation in (1) or (1'). Later in this paper we shall use for $\hat{\epsilon}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}')$ a power series in $\hat{r}$ and $\hat{r}'$ with undetermined coefficients, which is the most general form possible. However, to quantise the field using the Coulomb gauge we impose for the present the condition that

$$(\hat{\mathbf{k}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{k}}_2)\cdot\hat{\epsilon} = 0. \quad (3)$$

This restriction will be removed later.

From eqn. (A2) in Appendix A, we note that the non-local electric field in the Coulomb gauge is given by

$$\mathcal{E}(x, x') = -(1/c) \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}}{\partial t'} \right) = \frac{i}{c} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1 \lambda_1} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_2 \lambda_2} (\omega_{\mathbf{k}_1} + \omega_{\mathbf{k}_2}) [C_{12} \hat{\epsilon}_{12}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}') f(x, x') - \text{c.c.}] \quad (4)$$

where $f(x, x')$ is the phase factor in (2). The expression for the non-local magnetic field can be found in an analogous manner.

To obtain the field energy at a point $(\mathbf{r}, t)$ we need E^2 and B^2 which we define similarly as in (1) ; thus

$$E^2(\mathbf{r}, t) = \int \int \mathcal{E}(x, x') \cdot \mathcal{E}(x, x'') dx' dx''$$

where the limits of integration over dt' and dt'' are determined by the choice of interaction (retarded or advanced). However, in the present work r 's are of atomic dimensions, and we simply put $t', t'' \leq t$ for the retarded interaction and $t', t'' \geq t$ for the advanced interaction.

An examination of eqns. (2) and (4) shows that in E^2 and B^2 , the crossed terms between two modes $\mathbf{k}_1 \lambda_1$ and $\mathbf{k}_2 \lambda_2$ vanish unless the two modes are strongly phase-correlated. Denoting the population fractions of such correlated-pair modes and of the independent modes by a_{II} and a_{I} respectively, use of standard methods in Quantum Electrodynamics leads to the following expression for the field energy in a volume Ω :

$$W = a_{\text{I}}^2 W_{\text{I}} + a_{\text{II}}^2 W_{\text{II}} \quad (5)$$

where W_{I} is the usual energy summed over single modes, and

$$W_{\text{II}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} (Y_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^2 + 4\omega_{\mathbf{k}}^2 Z_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^2), \quad (5')$$

where $Y_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} = -i \frac{\sqrt{\Omega/\pi}}{2c} 2\omega_{\mathbf{k}} (C_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - C_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^*)$, $Z_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} = \frac{\sqrt{\Omega/\pi}}{2c} (C_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} + C_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^*)$. Each mode subscript here actually stands for a correlated mode pair $(\mathbf{k}_1 \lambda_1, \mathbf{k}_2 \lambda_2)$, and $2\omega_{\mathbf{k}}$ stands for $\omega_{\mathbf{k}_1} + \omega_{\mathbf{k}_2}$. Y and Z satisfy the canonical equations of motion with W_{II} as the Hamiltonian as in standard QED, and we now quantise this non-local field by requiring that Y and Z be q -numbers obeying the commutation relation

$$[Z_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}, Y_{\mathbf{k}'\lambda'}] = i\hbar \delta_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} \delta_{\lambda\lambda'}. \quad (6)$$

We thus obtain the non-local field energy in terms of a *new pair of creation and annihilation operators* :

$$W_{\text{II}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \hbar \omega_{\mathbf{k}} \left(b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^\dagger + b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^\dagger b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \right) \quad (5'')$$

$$\text{where } b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}, b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\hbar\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}} (2\omega_{\mathbf{k}} Z_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \pm iY_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}). \quad (7)$$

Equation (5'') is identical in form with standard QED, but the creation and annihilation operators obey a *new commutation relation* :

$$\left[b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}, b_{\mathbf{k}'\lambda'}^\dagger \right] = 2\delta_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}\delta_{\lambda\lambda'}, \quad [b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}, b_{\mathbf{k}'\lambda'}] = \left[b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^\dagger, b_{\mathbf{k}'\lambda'}^\dagger \right] = 0 \quad (8)$$

as may be directly verified from (7) and (6). The following, and only the following, results of operation of these new correlated-pair mode operators are consistent with the commutation rules (8) :

$$b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}|n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\rangle = \sqrt{n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}}|n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - 2\rangle, \quad b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^\dagger|n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\rangle = \sqrt{n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} + 2}|n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} + 2\rangle, \quad b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^\dagger b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}|n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\rangle = n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}|n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\rangle$$

This shows that b and $b^\dagger$ are *two-photon annihilation/creation operators*, and $b^\dagger b$ is the usual number operator. Once again, by creation of *two photons* we mean the creation of *one photon in each member of a correlated mode pair*, and similarly for annihilation. We can now write down the potential and field strengths in terms of these new operators ; thus

$$\mathcal{A}(x, x') = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\hbar c^2}{\Omega\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}} \hat{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}') \left[b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} f(x, x') + b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^\dagger f^*(x, x') \right] \quad (9a)$$

$$\mathcal{E}(x, x') = i \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\hbar\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}{\Omega}} \hat{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}') \left[b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} f(x, x') - b_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^\dagger f^*(x, x') \right] \quad (9b)$$

The results obtained so far from our non-locality postulate may be summed up as follows : quantization of a radiation field with a high degree of second-order coherence can depart from the usual QED and can lead to photon modes (more exactly: correlated mode pairs) generated by two-photon creation and annihilation operators. Indeed, if we let a zero-order dressed state of an atom $|\psi\rangle|n\rangle$ evolve in the presence of the non-local electron-radiation interaction (1) or (1'), we obtain a linear superposition of dressed states of the form

$$|\psi\rangle \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k(t) |2k\rangle \quad (10)$$

for even n ; for odd n , $|2k\rangle$ is replaced by $|2k+1\rangle$. The possibility of emission/absorption of two photons in the first order of interaction, i.e. linear in field intensity becomes evident at once as a consequence of this model. Also, the commutation relations (8) are gauge-independent, and hence from now on we can do away with the transversality restriction as mentioned after eqn.(3).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Before we work out the possible consequences of this non-local field in a typical atomic transition, let us note its formal similarity with a *squeezed* state. We recall the definition of the squeezed state [6] :

$$|\alpha, \zeta\rangle = D(\alpha)S(\zeta)|0\rangle, \quad (11)$$

where the *squeeze operator* $S(\zeta) = \exp[\frac{1}{2}\zeta^*a^2 - \frac{1}{2}\zeta(a^\dagger)^2]$, and the *displacement operator* $D(\alpha) = \exp(\alpha a^\dagger - \alpha^*a) = e^{\frac{-|\alpha|^2}{2}}e^{\alpha a^\dagger}e^{-\alpha^*a}$. (α and ζ are arbitrary complex numbers.) Putting $\alpha = 0$ gives the squeezed vacuum, while putting $\zeta = 0$ gives the coherent state. An expression for the squeezed vacuum in terms of the number states has been given by Hollenhorst [7] ; putting $\zeta = re^{i\theta}$, this becomes

$$S(\zeta)|0\rangle = (\cosh r)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2}e^{i\theta} \tanh r\right)^n \frac{\sqrt{2n!}}{n!} |2n\rangle \quad (12)$$

Thus we see that the squeezed vacuum $S(\zeta)|0\rangle$ has the same form as the expansion (10) above. The *two-mode squeezed vacuum* [8], where the squeezing operator is given by the more generalised form

$$S(\zeta) = \exp[\zeta(\omega)a^\dagger(\omega)a^\dagger(2\Omega - \omega) - \zeta^*(\omega)a(\omega)a(2\Omega - \omega)]$$

provides another example where the doubly occupied modes in (12) would be replaced by singly occupied correlated mode pairs ; the signal and idler photons generated in a parametric down-conversion present themselves at once as forming such a correlated pair. We can therefore say that the squeezing operator $S(\zeta)$ is mathematically identical (except for coefficients/multiplying factors) to the evolution operator in a non-local field, and hence atoms interacting with a squeezed field and with an intense radiation field (for which a non-local description is valid) can be expected to show the same non-classical features. We find below that it is indeed so.

We now work out two typical first-order transition matrix elements using this non-local description for a radiation field. Some of these results have appeared before [2b], but are included here for the sake of completeness. First it must be mentioned that depending on the photon flux and on the coherence properties of the laser field, one must in general describe the field as

$$\mathcal{E} = a_L \mathbf{E}_L + a_N \mathcal{E}_N \quad (13)$$

where the subscripts L and N refer to the local (usual) and the non-local fields respectively (a_L and a_N are identical with a_I and a_{II} in eqn.(5)) ; the relative strength of the two coefficients would depend, essentially, upon the degree to which the response of the atomic electron/s to the field appears phase-correlated.

We work within the dipole approximation, and formulate the typical matrix element of this two-photon absorption operator (I) for a single-electron atom, and (II) for a two-electron atom.

(I) For simplicity we confine ourselves to a single radiation mode $|n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\rangle$. Define

$$T_I = \langle \psi_{l_f m_f}(x), n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - 2 | \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathcal{E}_N(x, x') | \psi_{l_i m_i}(x'), n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \rangle \quad (14)$$

where the l 's are the orbital angular momenta in the initial and final states. We use equation (9b) for $\mathcal{E}_N(x, x')$ and note that the time integration in (14) for the non-local interaction yields the required energy balance $E_f = E_i + 2\hbar\omega_{\mathbf{k}}$ if and only if we use the

retarded interaction ; use of the advanced interaction fails to satisfy energy conservation. (See Appendix B for the mathematical details.) This remarkable result shows that causality as we understand it — *ability of the past, but not of the future, to influence the present* — follows as a necessary condition for energy conservation in our non-local picture of the electromagnetic field ; we have obtained a non-thermodynamic arrow of time having a purely quantum nature.

Incidentally, energy conservation is satisfied even if we set the upper limit of the integration over dt' (eqn.(B3), Appendix B) to t *exactly*, i.e. put $c = \infty$, which corresponds to an EPR-like “quantum entanglement”. Thus we find, as had been mentioned in the beginning, that such situations need not be left out from our non-local picture, and that causality in a quantum system need not be restricted by the special theory of relativity. However, if we go further in a closer analysis of the integration over dt' , we find that we can make an even stronger statement. Consider the case where $|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'| > ct$, in which case the upper limit in the t' -integral in (B3) becomes negative (remember that both $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{r}'$ extend over all space), and the integral vanishes, leading to non-conservation of energy ! Thus in our non-local picture of the quantum world, attempts to combine causality with the special theory of relativity are not only unnecessary, but can also lead to results which do not agree with experience ; one is immediately led to think of Bell’s theorem. Note that such an EPR-like correlation between x and x' is also indicated by the commutation relation (A3) in Appendix A, which gives the necessary condition for *gauge invariance* of the non-local electromagnetic field tensor.

Finally we get (in atomic units)

$$T_I = i \frac{\sqrt{2\pi I}}{c} \langle \psi_f(\mathbf{r}) | \mathbf{r} \cdot \hat{\epsilon}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}') | \psi_i(\mathbf{r}') \rangle \quad (15)$$

As mentioned earlier, we use for $\hat{\epsilon}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}')$ a power series in $\hat{r}$ and $\hat{r}'$ with undetermined coefficients ; the specific form chosen is

$$\hat{\epsilon}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}') = (\hat{r} + \hat{r}') \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n P_n(\hat{r} \cdot \hat{r}') \quad (16)$$

(Symmetry demands that the coefficients of $\hat{r}$ and of $\hat{r}'$ be identical.) Putting $\psi_i(\mathbf{r}) = N_i \frac{R_i(r)}{r} Y_{l_i m_i}(\hat{r})$ and similarly for ψ_f gives

$$T_I = i N_i N_f \times \frac{\sqrt{2\pi I}}{c} \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2) \quad (17)$$

where $\mathcal{R}$ is a radial integral, and the $\mathcal{I}$ ’s are two angular integrals, one of which gives the selection rule $l_f = l_i$, while the other gives $l_f = l_i, l_i \pm 2$. (See Appendix C for details.) Thus from (17) we obtain two-photon transitions of the type $S \rightarrow S, S \rightarrow D \dots$ linear in intensity. We also note that the squeezed vacuum corresponds to the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ in eqn. (11) ; an increase in α , which results among other things in an increase in intensity, leads to a deviation of the squeezed field from the form (12) to a situation where the summation

over mode indexes runs over all integers (instead of *only even or only odd integers* as in (10)), so that in the first order, an increase in intensity in squeezed light-matter interaction causes, progressively, single-photon transitions instead of the two-photon transitions as was the case in the squeezed vacuum. This result exactly matches the observation of Georgiades et al [1]. Other possible two-photon absorptions linear in intensity in a squeezed vacuum can be trivially predicted. Two possibilities immediately come to mind that should be experimentally feasible : (i) two-photon ionisation of a Rydberg atom, and (ii) two-photon electron detachment from a negative ion, both with a squeezed vacuum. Indeed, a whole field of non-destructive two-photon spectroscopy of atoms/molecules opens up.

At this point we should remark that the formal similarity between a squeezed field and a laser field with strong second-order coherence can become misleading when we consider the intensity variation of the fields interacting with matter. As we shall soon see, the higher the intensity, the more phase-correlated does the classical (thermal or laser) radiation field “appear” to two detectors (e.g. two atomic electrons), or one detector at two different times, rendering this non-local description the more valid. On the other hand, as we just saw, increase in intensity in a squeezed vacuum takes us back, so to say, into the classical domain (the two-photon transition becomes non-linear with increase in intensity).

(II) For a two-electron atom we require a matrix element of the type

$$T_{II} = \langle \psi_{l_f l'_f}(x, x'), n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - 2 | (\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}') \cdot \mathcal{E}_N(x, x') | \psi_{l_i l'_i}(x, x'), n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \rangle \quad (18)$$

As before, the time integration in (18) yields the energy balance $\delta(E_f, E_i + 2\hbar\omega_{\mathbf{k}})$, leaving

$$T_{II} = i \frac{\sqrt{2\pi I}}{c} \langle \psi_f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') | (\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}') \cdot \hat{\epsilon}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}') | \psi_i(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rangle \quad (19)$$

To evaluate T_{II} we use a correlated wavefunction of the form [9]

$$\psi = R^{-\frac{5}{2}} \sum_{\mu} F_{\mu}(R) \Phi_{\mu}(R; \alpha, \hat{r}, \hat{r}') \quad (20)$$

where $R = \sqrt{r^2 + r'^2}$ and $\alpha = \arctan(r'/r)$ are the hyperspherical coordinates.

Substituting eqns. (20) and (16) in (19) we obtain (see Appendix D for details)

$$\begin{aligned} T_{II} = & i \frac{\sqrt{2\pi I}}{c} \int F_f^*(R) R F_i(R) dR \int A_f A_i P_{n_f}^{(a_f, b_f)}(\cos 2\alpha) (\cos \alpha)^{l_f + l_i} \\ & \times (\sin \alpha)^{l'_f + l'_i} (\cos \alpha + \sin \alpha) P_{n_i}^{(a_i, b_i)}(\cos 2\alpha) \cos^2 \alpha \sin^2 \alpha d\alpha \\ & \int \int [\mathcal{Y}_{L_f l_f l'_f}^{M_f}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}')]^* (1 + P_1(\hat{r} \cdot \hat{r}') \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k P_k(\hat{r} \cdot \hat{r}') \mathcal{Y}_{L_i l_i l'_i}^{M_i}(\hat{r}, \hat{r}') d\hat{r} d\hat{r}' \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

We obtain the selection rules for l_f and l'_f from the two angular integrals, one involving $\sum_k a_k P_k(\hat{r} \cdot \hat{r}')$ and the other involving $\sum_k a_k P_1(\hat{r} \cdot \hat{r}') P_k(\hat{r} \cdot \hat{r}')$. They are tedious but

straightforward ; note that although the coefficients a_k are unknown, the relative strength of the two terms can be analytically obtained. For the first integral, both Δl and $\Delta l'$ are even for even k and odd for odd k , whereas for the second integral Δl and $\Delta l'$ turn out to be odd for even k and even for odd k . Thus finally we see that parity is conserved, as in the single-electron case.

For carrying out the integration over $d\alpha$ one can use the result [10]

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-1}^1 (1-x)^\rho (1+x)^\sigma P_n^{(\alpha,\beta)}(x) P_m^{(\gamma,\delta)}(x) dx \\ &= \frac{2^{\rho+\sigma+1} (1+\alpha)_n (1+\gamma)_m \Gamma(\sigma+1) \Gamma(\rho+1)}{m! n! \Gamma(\rho+\sigma+2)} \sum_{r=0}^m \frac{(-m)_r (1+\gamma+\delta+m)_r (1+\rho)_r}{r! (1+\gamma)_r (\rho+\sigma+2)_r} \\ & \times {}_3F_2(-n, 1+\alpha+\beta+n, 1+\rho+r; 1+\alpha, 2+\rho+\sigma+r; 1) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

On symmetry grounds, $\Delta n = n_f - n_i$ is always even ; sample calculations show that the integral over $d\alpha$ is strongly peaked when $n_f = n_i$. We see therefore that this two-photon transition *maintains the radial correlation* in the two-electron atom.

We can now summarise the properties of the matrix element T as follows :

- (i) It is a two-photon excitation linear in the field strength ;
- (ii) It conserves the parity of the atom ;
- (iii) For a two-electron atom, it conserves the degree of radial correlation.

In view of eqn.(13) this double excitation will be running, in general, parallel to usual single-photon transitions in an experiment, and hence in any multiphoton excitation process in a field having a strong second-order coherence the overall transition would have the form $TTDDTD\dots$ or some such random mixture (D 's are single-photon transition moments), tending towards the extreme form $TTTTT\dots$ as the field grows more intense. If we start out with a closed-shell atom in an S -state, such a series of T -transitions would result in the formation of strongly correlated doubly excited states which are known to favour simultaneous double electron escape (Wannier [11] ; see also the review articles of Fano [9] and Rau [12]). This is to be contrasted with *sequential* two-electron escape, which does not involve any electron correlation.

We now demonstrate briefly that many of the features observed in multiphoton double ionisation in atoms placed in strong laser fields can be shown to follow as natural consequences of this non-local field model. A fuller demonstration can be found in [2b]. As mentioned at the outset, interaction of matter with a strong radiation field fits into this non-local picture if two photons are absorbed by an atom within a time interval $\delta t \ll \frac{1}{\omega}$. For practical purposes this requirement can be replaced by a more convenient one, namely that in a time $\frac{1}{\omega}$, the number of photons flowing into and out of the "volume" V of the atomic shell occupied by the outer electron/s be much larger than the number of these outer electrons. Thus for an n -(outer)-electron atom the condition reads

$$\frac{VI}{c\omega^2} \gg n \quad (23)$$

On the other hand, when the correlated motion of two electrons is involved (see discussion after eqn.(22)), we have to remember that the laser electric field should be significantly smaller than the Coulomb fields within the atom, in order that the electrons can maintain their mutual correlation. Choosing a field of order 10^{-2} a.u. gives us a crude estimate for an upper limit

$$I_{max} \sim 10^{13} \text{ W/cm}^2 \quad (24)$$

to the laser intensity upto which we can expect electron correlation in a two-electron atom to be maintained.

We now examine some physical consequences of our model QED and compare them with observed features in Multiphoton Ionisation (MPI) and Above-threshold Ionisation (ATI) experiments. Earlier, the occurrence of a *TT*.-like chain was shown to lead to the possibility of *direct double ionisation* (as opposed to *sequential* double ionisation) [13] ; we now see that the possibility can materialise if and only if both the conditions (23) and (24) are fulfilled. Simple considerations show that for short wavelengths the two conditions can become mutually exclusive, thus ruling out the possibility of Direct Double Ionization (DDI), whereas for long wavelengths both conditions (23) and (24) can be satisfied over a broad range of intensities. There is a caveat, though ; for *very large* wavelengths the condition (23) can be satisfied at quite low intensities, but the rather large number of *D*'s in the multiphoton excitation chain *TTDDTTD* . . . will tend to spoil the electron correlation pattern. Also, for a given power output, the peak intensity in short laser pulses is higher than in longer ones, and hence we should expect DDI to occur more readily with shorter pulses than with long pulses. This accords with the observations of L'Huillier et al [14] who measured multiphoton ionisation in Xenon using both nanosecond and picosecond pulsed lasers at 1064 nm and 532 nm, and those of Agostini and Petite [15] and Delone et al [16] who measured MPI of Ca at 1064 nm with picosecond pulses and nanosecond pulses respectively. Furthermore, Yergeau et al [17] found that in MPI of rare gases using a CO₂ laser ($\lambda = 9.55\mu$ and 10.55μ), the multiply charged ions are formed *sequentially*.

In a strong laser field, another interesting effect stems from the photon number-phase uncertainty relation $\Delta N \Delta \phi \geq 1$. The atomic electron/s during the two-photon excitation is/are acting as a device that measures the incident radiation phase to within an accuracy $\Delta \phi = \omega \delta t$. Consequently the photon number would be uncertain by $\Delta N \sim \frac{1}{\omega \delta t}$, and this would shift the photoelectron spectrum by an amount $\Delta N \hbar \omega$, resulting in the suppression of ΔN lower-order peaks. This is a very well-known phenomenon in ATI (e.g. [18]) ; attempts to explain it have so far met with only partial success. Note that in the case of two electrons, they can act individually as such phase-measuring devices and no correlation is required ; as such, this feature is not restricted by the condition (24). Indeed, peak suppression (also known as quenching) has been observed at very high intensities ($\sim 10^{16}$ W/cm²).

Use of circularly polarised light lends a particularly interesting twist to this aspect. A circularly polarised photon can be regarded as a superposition of two linearly polarised components 90° apart in phase, and hence even if two circularly polarised photons arrive with a phase gap $\omega \delta t = \frac{\pi}{2}$ between them, the *x*-component of one photon and the *y*-component of the other can still be in exact phase correlation. This implies that the

coherence condition $\delta t \ll \frac{1}{\omega}$ can be relaxed to $\delta t \sim \frac{1}{\omega}$, i.e. it would be satisfied at much smaller intensities. Thus at any given intensity, many more lower-order ATI peaks can be expected to be quenched by circularly polarised light than by linearly polarised light. This feature has indeed been observed (e.g. Bucksbaum et al [19], Bashkansky et al [20]). Interestingly, this also allows us to *predict* that with a circularly polarised laser, onset of DDI should occur in MPI experiments at lower intensities than with linearly polarised lasers.

In conclusion, we find that our non-local model of QED gives us a correlated two-photon absorption which, unlike the conventional four-field correlation function, occurs in the first order of perturbation and is therefore linear in intensity. A single first-order matrix element $[T_I, \text{eqn.}(17)]$ exactly reproduces the experimental finding of Georgiades et al [1], while in higher orders we obtain results that match very well with several experimental findings in MPI and ATI of atoms. From a detailed work-out of the non-local QED we obtain a non-thermodynamic arrow of time, and we also find that correlations in a quantum system must necessarily be of the EPR-type, a result that agrees with Bell's theorem. This non-local model QED can certainly be further improved upon by way of rigour and sophistication, but we believe that, basically, we have been able to demonstrate its usefulness.

APPENDIX A

In this appendix we use relativistic notation, with units $\hbar = c = 1$. Let A^0 and $\mathbf{A}$ be the scalar and vector potentials of an electromagnetic field. In field theory, the four-potential $A^\mu \equiv (A^0, \mathbf{A})$ is usually introduced through imposition of the requirement of covariance under a $U(1)$ gauge transformation (of the type $e^{-ie\Lambda(x)}$), and this is done via construction of the covariant derivative $D_\mu = \partial_\mu + ieA_\mu$ ($A_\mu = g_{\mu\nu}A^\nu$, $g_{\mu\nu}$ being the metric tensor) and replacement of the partial derivatives in the Lagrangian (e.g. of a complex scalar field ϕ) by these covariant derivatives. From this gauge-covariant Lagrangian $D_\mu\phi D^\mu\phi$ we obtain the *interaction Lagrangian* $-ej^\mu A_\mu$, where $j^\mu = i(\phi^*\partial^\mu\phi - \phi\partial^\mu\phi^*)$. (Of course, these A_μ 's need not be a dynamical field but can be a pure gauge field as well [21] ; however, this does not concern us here.)

A significant point that is often lost sight of is that, in order to achieve gauge covariance, *it is not a necessary condition* that this interaction Lagrangian be *local* ; indeed, we can write down a non-local Lagrangian in a similar manner. Consider a non-local $U(1)$ gauge transformation of the kind $\exp(-ie\Lambda|x\rangle\langle x'|)$. It is easily seen that a covariant derivative can be constructed as $D_\mu = \partial_\mu + d_\mu + ie\mathcal{A}_\mu|x\rangle\langle x'|$, (where $d_\mu \equiv \partial/\partial x'^\mu$ and we have written $\mathcal{A}_\mu|x\rangle\langle x'| \equiv g_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{A}^\nu|x\rangle\langle x'|$), provided that $\mathcal{A}_\mu$ transforms under the gauge transformation as

$$\mathcal{A}_\mu \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\mu + \partial_\mu\Lambda|x\rangle\langle x'| + d_\mu\Lambda|x\rangle\langle x'|. \quad (\text{A1})$$

It can be readily verified that this transformation property is consistent with the requirement of *gauge invariance* of the non-local (electromagnetic) field tensor

$$\mathcal{F}^{\mu\nu}|x\rangle\langle x'| = (\partial^\mu + d^\mu)\mathcal{A}^\nu|x\rangle\langle x'| - (\partial^\nu + d^\nu)\mathcal{A}^\mu|x\rangle\langle x'| \quad (\text{A2})$$

under this new gauge transformation, *provided that*

$$[\partial^\mu, d^\nu] = 0. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Ultimately, we have to replace A_μ in the above-defined interaction Lagrangian by $g_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{A}^\nu|x\rangle\langle x'|$. We see, therefore, that our non-local potential *is consistent with the basic requirement of gauge covariance of the Lagrangian*. Our eqn.(1) for the matrix element $M_{fi}(t)$ follows directly from this non-local interaction.

The nature of the correlation between x and x' in this formulation is laid down by the above commutation relation (A3), which indicates that x and x' must be completely independent, i.e. there is no restriction that their interval be time-like. We postpone a detailed discussion of this point till later ; in connection with eqn.(14) we shall show (see second paragraph after the eqn.in text) that energy conservation at the atomic level requires that this correlation must, of necessity, be of the EPR-type.

APPENDIX B

We show in this appendix that only the retarded interaction can lead to energy conservation. The time-integral in (14), with retarded correlation, is given by

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(E_f t - \hbar\omega t)} dt \int_{-\infty}^{t-\rho/c} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}(E_i t' + \hbar\omega t')} dt' = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) dt \int_{-\infty}^{t-\rho/c} g(t') dt' \quad (\text{say}) \quad (\text{B1})$$

($\rho = |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|$), while with the advanced correlation we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) dt \int_{t+\rho/c}^{\infty} g(t') dt' \quad (\text{B2})$$

The expression (B1) can be written as a sum of two integrals :

$$\int_{-\infty}^0 f(t) dt \int_{-\infty}^{t-\rho/c} g(t') dt' + \int_0^{\infty} f(t) dt \int_{-\infty}^{t-\rho/c} g(t') dt' \quad (\text{B1}')$$

while the expression (B2) can be written as

$$\int_{-\infty}^0 f(t) dt \int_{t+\rho/c}^{\infty} g(t') dt' + \int_0^{\infty} f(t) dt \int_{t+\rho/c}^{\infty} g(t') dt' \quad (\text{B2}')$$

Elementary considerations show that the first integral in (B1') and the second integral in (B2') contribute nothing, while the other two integrals are (to within factors) given by $\delta(E_f, E_i + 2\hbar\omega)$. Energy conservation in the two-photon transition thus results, as it were, when we sum up our “samplings” of the phase of the matrix element over extended periods of time.

We now come to the question of the significance of the *limits* of the integrals over dt . The matrix element is, so to say, **created** when we have photoexcited the atom ; let us agree to define that this act has been done at the instant $t = 0$. The crucial point to remember is that although the photoexcitation is not an irreversible process (the atom can certainly be de-excited again), *our acts of exciting and subsequently observing the atom are irreversible in time*. Therefore we can sample the phase (or whatever else we like to) of the excitation matrix element only at times $t \geq 0$. Thus the first integral in (B2'), although non-vanishing, is actually non-physical (it is just as meaningful as sampling the behavioural pattern of a baby before the baby is born), and we are left with only one non-vanishing integral in (B1')

$$\int_0^{\infty} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}(E_f t - \hbar\omega t)} dt \int_{-\infty}^{t-\rho/c} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}(E_i t' + \hbar\omega t')} dt' \quad (\text{B3})$$

Thus energy conservation will be satisfied if and only if temporal correlation is provided by the past, and not by the future ; we have derived an arrow of time in quantum physics as a necessary condition for energy conservation.

APPENDIX C

Elementary analysis shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R} &= \int_0^\infty R_i(r) r^2 dr \int_0^\infty R_f(r) r dr, \\ \mathcal{I}_1 &= \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{4\pi a_n}{2n+1} \sum_{\nu=-n}^n \int Y_{l_f m_f}^*(\hat{r}) Y_{n\nu}(\hat{r}) d\hat{r} \int Y_{n\nu}^*(\hat{r}') Y_{l_i m_i}(\hat{r}') d\hat{r}', \\ \text{and } \mathcal{I}_2 &= \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{16\pi^2 a_n}{3(2n+1)} \sum_{\nu=-n}^n \sum_{m=-1}^1 \int Y_{l_f m_f}^*(\hat{r}) Y_{1m}(\hat{r}) Y_{n\nu}(\hat{r}) d\hat{r} \\ &\quad \times \int Y_{1m}^*(\hat{r}') Y_{n\nu}^*(\hat{r}') Y_{l_i m_i}(\hat{r}') d\hat{r}'\end{aligned}$$

The first angular integral gives $l_f = l_i$, while the second integral, which can be evaluated using the Gaunt formula, vanishes unless $n = l_f \pm 1$ and $n = l_i \pm 1$. Combining these two we get the selection rules $l_f = l_i$, $l_i \pm 2$.

APPENDIX D

The materials in this appendix are standard, and are included only for the sake of completeness. More details may be found in [9] (we have introduced some minor changes in notation). The Schrödinger equation for a two-electron atom in hyperspherical coordinates takes the form

$$\left[\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial R^2} + \frac{\Lambda^2}{R^2} \right) + V - E \right] \Psi(R, \alpha, \hat{r}, \hat{r}') = 0 \quad (\text{D1})$$

where the “grand angular momentum operator”

$$\Lambda^2 = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha^2} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{l(l+1)}{\cos^2 \alpha} + \frac{l'(l'+1)}{\sin^2 \alpha} \quad (\text{D2})$$

Also, $V = -\frac{Z}{r} - \frac{Z}{r'} + \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}$, the total Coulomb interaction within the atom, and m is the electron mass. The channel eigenfunctions Φ 's in (20) are obtained by configuration mixing in a basis of eigenfunctions of the grand angular momentum operator (D2). The eigenfunctions of this operator are

$$\phi_{nl'l'LM} = A(\cos \alpha)^l (\sin \alpha)^{l'} P_n^{(a,b)}(\cos 2\alpha) \mathcal{Y}_{Ll'}^M(\hat{r}, \hat{r}') \quad (\text{D3})$$

where A is a normalisation constant, $a = l' + \frac{1}{2}$, $b = l + \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\mathcal{Y}_{Ll'}^M = \sum_{m=-l}^l \sum_{m'=-l'}^{l'} (ll'mm'|ll'LM) Y_{lm}(\hat{r}) Y_{l'm'}(\hat{r}'),$$

$$P_n^{(a,b)}(x) = \frac{(a+1)_n}{n!} {}_2F_1 \left(-n, a+b+n+1; a+1; \frac{1-x}{2} \right) \quad (\text{D4})$$

is the Jacobi polynomial, and n is the radial correlation quantum number, the same as n_{rc} of Fano [9]. The eigenvalues of Λ^2 are given by $\lambda(\lambda+1)\hbar^2$, where $\lambda = 2n + l + l' + \frac{3}{2}$. Thus for each channel μ in (20) we can write

$$\Phi_\mu = \sum_j C_{\mu j} \phi_j(\alpha, \hat{r}, \hat{r}')$$

where the running index $j \equiv (n, l, l', L, M)$ collectively.

In hyperspherical coordinates the total Coulomb potential V is given by

$$V = \frac{e^2}{R} C(\alpha, \hat{r}, \hat{r}'), \quad C = -\frac{Z}{\cos \alpha} - \frac{Z}{\sin \alpha} + \frac{1}{(1 - \hat{r} \cdot \hat{r}' \sin 2\alpha)^{1/2}} \quad (\text{D5})$$

The hyperradial functions $F_\mu(R)$ in (20) are given by the coupled equations

$$\left[\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \left(-\frac{d^2}{dR^2} + \frac{\lambda(\lambda+1)}{R^2} \right) - E \right] F_\mu(R) + \frac{e^2}{R} \sum_{\mu'} V_{\mu\mu'} F_{\mu'}(R) \delta_{LL'} \delta_{MM'} = 0 \quad (\text{D6})$$

Restricting ourselves to a single configuration in (20) and substituting eqn.(16) in (19), we obtain eqn. (21) for T_{II} .

REFERENCES :

- [1] N P Georgiades, E S Polzik, K Edamatsu, H J Kimble and A S Parkins, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3426 (1995). See also Z Ficek and P D Drummond, Phys. Today, Sept. 1997, p.34
- [2](a) T K Rai Dastidar and K Rai Dastidar, XI Int.Conf.At.Phys. (Paris, 1988) p. I-23 ;
(b) K Rai Dastidar in *Advances in Atomic and Molecular Physics*, ed. M S Z Chaghtai (Today's and Tomorrow's Publishers, New Delhi, India 1992) p. 49. Some modifications over these early papers have been carried out in the present paper in the detailed work-out of the non-local ansatz ; however, the conclusions in these earlier works are not affected.
- [3] J Gea-Banacloche, Phys.Rev.Lett. **62**, 1603 (1989)
- [4] J Javanainen and P L Gould, Phys. Rev A **41**, 5088 (1990)
- [5] I M Gelfand and G E Shilov, *Generalised Functions* Vol. 1, Chap. 2, eq. 1.3(1) (Academic Press, 1964)
- [6] See, e.g. C M Caves, Phys.Rev.D **23**, 1693 (1981)
- [7] J N Hollenhorst, Phys.Rev.D **19**, 1669 (1979)
- [8] V Buzek, P L Knight and I K Kudryavtsev, Phys.Rev.A **44**, 1931 (1991) and references therein.
- [9] U Fano, Rep.Prog.Phys. **46**, 97 (1983)
- [10] R C Varma and J S Bharadwaj, Proc.Natl.Acad.Sci.India **54A**, 422 (1984)
- [11] G Wannier, Phys.Rev. **90**, 817 (1953)
- [12] A R P Rau, Phys.Rep. **110**, 369 (1984)
- [13] In an MPI experiment where ion counts are plotted against laser intensity, this feature is characterised by the appearance of a doubly charged ion signal *before* the saturation of the singly charged ion signal. See e.g. K Rai Dastidar in *Atomic and Molecular Physics*, eds. D K Rai and D N Tripathi (World Scientific, Singapore 1987), p. 323.
- [14] A L'Huillier, L A Lompre, G Mainfray and C Manus, J.Phys.B **16**, 1363 (1983) ; Phys. Rev. A **27**, 2503 (1983)
- [15] P Agostini and G Petite, J.Phys.B **17**, L811 (1984)
- [16] N B Delone, V V Suran and B A Zon, in *Multiphoton Ionization of Atoms* eds. S L Chin and P Lambopoulos (Acad. Press, New York 1984) p. 247
- [17] F Yergeau, S L Chin and P Lavigne, J.Phys.B **20**, 723 (1987)
- [18] M Crance, Phys.Rep. **144**, 117 (1987)
- [19] P H Bucksbaum, M Bashkansky, R P Freeman, T J McIlrath and L F DiMauro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 2590 (1986)
- [20] M Bashkansky, P H Bucksbaum and D Schumacher, Phys.Rev.Lett. **59**, 274 (1987)
- [21] T K Rai Dastidar and K Rai Dastidar, Mod.Phys.Letts. **A10**, 1843 (1995)